

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RHONDA DEANN CADWELL,

Defendant and Appellant.

D075636

(Super. Ct. No. SCN391784)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Daniel B. Goldstein, Judge. Affirmed.

Arthur Martin, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Rhonda Deann Cadwell entered into a plea agreement under the terms of which she pleaded guilty to possession of methamphetamine for sale (Health and Saf. Code, § 11378) and admitted the weight enhancement under Health and Safety Code section 11370.4, subdivision (b)(2) (four kilograms of methamphetamine). The

remaining charges were dismissed. The parties stipulated to a sentence of six years four months in local prison with no split in the sentence. The court sentenced Cadwell in accordance with the plea agreement.

Cadwell filed a timely notice of appeal.

Appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) indicating he has not been able to identify any arguable issue for reversal on appeal. Counsel asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *Wende*. We offered Cadwell the opportunity to file her own brief on appeal, but she has not responded.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

The change of plea form contains an admission that Cadwell knowingly possessed in excess of four kilograms of methamphetamine for sale. At the plea hearing Cadwell verbally acknowledged the statements were true.

DISCUSSION

As we have noted, appellate counsel has not identified any arguable issue for reversal on appeal and has asked the court to review the record as mandated by *Wende*. Indeed, counsel has declined to identify any "potential issue" in compliance with *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*). As counsel states: "Counsel acknowledges that some justices have expressed a strong desire for listing issues under [*Anders*], but counsel has carefully weighed the situation and concluded the approach needed to promote the client's interests in this particular case is to invite court review of the record unfettered by counsel's prior thought processes."

We find counsel's dismissal of the *Anders* review and the implied assertion that compliance with *Anders* would somehow limit this court's mandated review of the record to be inappropriate and unhelpful.

Notwithstanding counsel's attitude, we have been able to thoroughly review the record. We have not found anything in the record that could raise an arguable issue for reversal on appeal. Competent counsel has represented Cadwell on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

O'ROURKE, J.

IRION, J.